UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,525	04/09/2004	Thomas J. Meitzler	TA-3127	4308
29322	7590 09/04/2007		EXAMINER	
U.S. ARMY TACOM ATTN: AMSTA-LP/281			WERNER, DAVID N	
6501 E. 11 MILE RD. WARREN, MI 48397-5000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			2621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/828,525	MEITZLER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David N. Werner	2621			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING II. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 April 2004</u> is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	·				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	ate			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20060425.	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	Patent Application			

1. This is the First Action on the Merits for US Patent Application 10/828,525.

Currently, claims 1-14 are pending.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the second

sentence of paragraph 7 and the last sentence of paragraph 18 do not end with a

period.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: the specification does not include any mention of the

"geometric seating layout" of claim 3 or the "ticket database" of claims 6, 10, and 11.

Double Patenting

4. Applicant is advised that should claim 2 be found allowable, claim 12 will be

objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two

claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both

cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing

Art Unit: 2621

one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 4,816,828 (Feher) in view of US Patent 5,670,936 A (Schofield et al). Feher discloses an aircraft surveillance system. This system can be adapted to view the exterior of an aircraft to gauge damage, or the interior for security monitoring. Regarding claim 1, in one embodiment of Feher, a series of interior cameras 40 are mounted in the passenger cabin of a commercial aircraft, so that at least one camera monitors each section of the cabin, along with the doors to the cabin and the cargo bay (column 7: lines 19-30). These cameras correspond with the claimed "plurality of video cameras". The outputs from these cameras are routed through controller 60 and processed (column 7: lines 60-62). This controller corresponds with the claimed "multiplexer" and "control computer". The pilot can control camera selector 92 to select one or more video channels for viewing (column 8: line 60-column 9: line 7). This corresponds with the claimed "controller". However, although Feher discloses

Application/Control Number: 10/828,525

Art Unit: 2621

that multiple channels may be viewed at once (column 8: line 68), Feher does not detail how this is accomplished.

Schofield et al. discloses a panoramic rearview vision system for a motor vehicle. Regarding claim 1, in the system of Schofield et al., image processor 18 receives data signals from side cameras 14 and central camera 16 to produce a composite image (column 3: lines 56-65). The composite image is displayed seamlessly to present a virtual panoramic view, as shown in figure 3 (column 5: lines 59-62). Then, the processor of Schofield et al. corresponds with the claimed "image processing system" and "image enhancing system". (In Feher et al., the cameras are explicitly referred to as "high-resolution" cameras (column 9: lines 19-20)).

Feher discloses the claimed invention except for stitching together multiple video frames to provide a large image. Schofield et al. teaches that it was known to stitch together images from various cameras to produce a virtual wide-field image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to join images produced from multiple cameras into a single continuous image for display, as taught by Schofield et al., since Schofield et al. states in column 6, lines 2-5 that such a modification would provide a more natural, easier-to-understand view from multiple cameras than as multiple distinct views.

Regarding claims 4 and 9, in Feher, telemetry transfer means 80 transfers the video signals to ground stations 82 for analysis (column 8: lines 28-42). This corresponds with the claimed "transceiver". Regarding claim 5, infrared cameras may be used in the system of Feher for "night vision" viewing (column 9: lines 19-31).

Art Unit: 2621

Regarding claim 7, video received by ground receptors 82 may be stored in a database to be further analyzed for security reasons (column 8: lines 34-39).

7. Claims 2, 8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feher in view of Schofield et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent 4,831,438 (Bellman et al.). Feher teaches a video surveillance system for use in a vehicle interior, but does not disclose the claimed feature of an icon representation of the vehicle interior.

Bellman et al. teaches a surveillance system for an aircraft. Regarding claims 2 and 12, figure 7 of Bellman et al. shows the control panel for the surveillance system. This control panel includes switch array 481 to activate a sensor (camera), monitor 488 to display images from the currently-selected sensor, and headphone jack 438 to monitor audio information from the currently-selected sensor (column 11: lines 5-49). Also included is indicator array 482 comprised of a series of LEDs that show the status of the surveillance system (column 11: lines 11-13). By viewing the indicator array, a viewer may learn which area of the vehicle is currently under surveillance (column 11: lines 44-49).

Feher in view of Schofield et al. teaches the claimed invention except for displaying an iconic representation of a vehicle interior to show the portion of the interior being shown on an image display. Bellman et al. teaches that it was known to graphically illustrate which portion of a vehicle interior is being monitored in a multicamera surveillance system through an indicator array. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the indicator array of Bellman et al. into the surveillance system of Feher to instantly show to a viewer using a vehicle surveillance system which portion of the vehicle is being monitored, since it has been held that combining known prior art elements according to a known method to yield predictable results involves only routine skill in the art. See *Anderson's Black Rock Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.*, 396 U.S. 57, 163 USPQ 673 (1969).

Regarding claim 8, this claim is merely an aggregation of the limitations previously presented in claims 1, 2, and 5, discussed above.

8. Claims 3, 6, 10, 11, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feher, in view of Schofield et al., and in view of Bellman et al. as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of US Patent 5,621,430 A (Bricklin). Feher does not disclose the claimed feature of a ticket database. Bellman et al. discloses an iconic representation of a vehicle, but not at the claimed detail level of individual passengers.

Bricklin describes a computer Graphical User Interface (GUI). Regarding claim 3, one application of the GUI of Bricklin is to display a seating chart for an aircraft, as illustrated in claim 12. A display shows first level window 1205, showing the seating for the entire aircraft, indicator 1215 that highlights a portion of the seating chart, and second level window 1210 that shows a detailed view of the portion of the seating chart highlighted by indicator 1215 (column 16: lines 1-17). Regarding claims 6 and 10, a

user may view special information about an individual passenger, such as a meal request or relevant medical information (column 16: lines 18-50). By selecting a seat with an icon associated with special information, a user can view details of the information (column 17: lines 5-21).

The combination of Feher, Schofield et al., and Bellman et al. disclose the claimed invention except for providing a visual display of individual vehicular passenger locations, or a database containing ticketed passenger information. Bricklin teaches that it was known to display passenger information in a seating chart format. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the visual passenger database of Bricklin into the video monitoring system of Feher, since Bricklin states in column 16, lines 51-53 that such a modification would provide a linkage between detailed passenger data and the location of the passenger in the vehicle.

Regarding claim 11, this claim is merely an aggregation of the limitations previously presented in claims 1 and 6, discussed above. Regarding claim 13, in Feher, telemetry transfer means 80 transfers video signals to ground station 82 for analysis (column 8: lines 28-42). This corresponds with the claimed transceiver. Regarding claim 14, infrared cameras may be used in the system of Feher for "night vision" viewing (column 9: lines 19-31).

Application/Control Number: 10/828,525 Page 8

Art Unit: 2621

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Patent 4,843,463 (Michetti) discloses a vehicle monitoring system that shows a split-screen between images from a forward camera and a rearward camera. US Patent 5,742,336 A (Lee) and US Patent 6,580,450 B1 (Kersting et al.) each disclose an aircraft surveillance system that relays video to a ground station via satellite. US Patent 6,831,680 B1 (Kumler) teaches an aircraft surveillance system that uses one or more fisheye lenses to display a wide field of view. US Patent Application Publication 2002/0004695 A1 (Glenn et al.) discloses a Flight Data Recorder that includes multiple video recorders. US Patent Application Publication 2004/0008253 A1 (Monroe) discloses a general aircraft and airport monitoring system. Irish Patent Application Publication 2003-0138 A2 (Sullivan et al.) discloses an interactive risk mapping system in which hazard data is associated with a physical location.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David N. Werner whose telephone number is (571) 272-9662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri, can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/828,525 Page 9

Art Unit: 2621

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DNW

AUTING SE 8/31/07